UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/642,256	08/15/2003	Wei Yuan	P1028 (16221RRUS02)	1538

64458   7590   11/15/2007
HEMINGWAY & HANSEN, LLP
1717 MAIN STREET
BANK ONE CENTER, SUITE 2500
DALLAS, TX 75201

EXAMINER
TOLENTINO, RODERICK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2134	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/642,256	YUAN, WEI
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Roderick Tolentino	2134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _09/11/2007_.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _15 August 2003_ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

   1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1 – 20 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed 09/11/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

3.   Applicant argues that Trossen fails to teach the "creation of a pinhole request or creating a pinhole communication port in a firewall in response to the creation of a pinhole request." Examiner respectfully disagrees. Trossen teaches receiving a create pinhole request at a trusted entity linked to the firewall of the communication network and located outside the communication network (Trossen, Paragraph 0024, RSVP protocol). As discussed in the previous office action, a the creation of a pinhole there will be some form of messaging that occurs in order for the pinhole created. Anyone of ordinary skill in the art would know that messages are sent through a system when something is created. In this case a pinhole is being created in the firewall. There has to be some form of messaging that goes on in order to create the pinhole. This is especially in the case where an object to allow information is being created in a firewall which is designed to allow only authorized information in and out. Applicant goes on to further argue the point that a pinhole is not part of the RSVP protocol. Despite this fact the pinhole is still taught by the Trossen reference so regardless of the RSVP protocol discussing a pinhole or not is moot since Trossen clearly states the pinhole creation on paragraph 0024.

4.   Applicant further argues that Trossen fails to teach that the pinhole transmits a

packet through the pinhole. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Trossen teaches said link

allowing information packets to be sent to a first communication pinhole through the

firewall to the communication device and said entity replacing an address designation in

the address header of one of said information packets with an address designation for

the first communication pinhole so the information packet can be transmitted through

·said pinhole to said communication device (Trossen, Paragraph 0024, pinhole is

created in the firewall with use of IP-Level Handoff). The pinhole created by the

Trossen is created with a new IP path. Anyone of ordinary skill in the art would know

that an IP path is a path where data is sent through, thus the IP with the pinhole will

transmit packet information.

5.   Applicant argues that Trossen, fails to teach, teach or even suggest, "replacing

an address in the address header of an information packet with an address for the

communication pinhole." Examiner respectfully disagrees. Trossen teaches link

allowing information packets to be sent to a first communication pinhole through the

firewall to the communication device and said trusted entity replacing an address

designation in the address header of one of said information packets with an address

·designation for the first communication pinhole so the information packet can be

transmitted through said pinhole to said communication device (Trossen, Paragraph

0024, pinhole is created in the firewall with use of IP-Level Handoff). Trossen shows an

IP-level handoff with a new-care-of address needed to send the media content. The

new address described by Trossen is a new-care- of address. The address is for a new

access router, thus this will cause a new address to be used for packet information..

The new address will replace the old address information.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically teachd or described as set forth
> in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the
> prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention
> was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   Claims 1 – 13 and 15 – 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Trossen et al. U.S. PG-Publication No. (2003/0212764) and in view

of O'keefe U.S. Patent No. (6,941,477).

8.   As per claim 1, Trossen teaches a firewall on the communication network

gateway for securing communications to and from the network (Trossen, Paragraph

0024), a communication device on the communication network connected to the firewall

by a communication link (Trossen, Paragraph 0007, mobile node) an entity linked to the

firewall by a communication link (Trossen, Paragraph 0007, Content sources), said link

allowing information packets to be sent to a first communication pinhole through the

firewall to the communication device and said entity replacing an address designation in

the address header of one of said information packets with an address designation for

the first communication pinhole so the information packet can be transmitted through

said pinhole to said communication device (Trossen, Paragraph 0024, pinhole is

created in the firewall with use of IP-Level Handoff), but fails to teach a trusted entity.

However, in an analogous art O'keefe teaches a trusted entity (O'Keefe Col. 1 Lines 47

– 55, trusted server).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to person of

ordinary skill in the art to use O'Keefe's trusted content server with Trossen's relocation

of content sources during IP-level handoffs because it offers the advantage of seeing if

content received can be trusted based on its origins (O'Keefe Col. 2 Lines 30 – 40).

9.   As per claim 2, Trossen teaches the first communication pinhole is established

using signaling messages transmitted through the firewall (Trossen, Paragraph 0024,

Signaling protocols).

10.   As per claim 3, Trossen teaches the signaling messages include a create pinhole

message (Trossen, Paragraph 0024).

11.   As per claim 4, Trossen teaches the signaling messages include a create pinhole

acknowledge message (Trossen, Paragraph 0024, confirmation messages).

As per claim 5, Trossen teaches the trusted entity is a media proxy router

(Trossen, Paragraph 0024, New access router).

12.   As per claim 6, Trossen teaches the trusted entity includes a component with a

software functional switch (Trossen, Paragraph 0024, New access router).

13.   As per claim 7, Trossen teaches the communication network includes an

application server on the communication link between the firewall and the

communication device (Trossen, Paragraph 0007, Content sources).

14.   As per claim 8, Trossen teaches receiving a create pinhole request at an entity

linked to the firewall of the communication network and located outside the

communication network (Trossen, Paragraph 0024, RSVP protocol), creating a pinhole

communication port in the firewall in response to the create pinhole request, receiving a

first information packet at the entity to be transmitted across the firewall through said

pinhole, replacing an address in the information packet address header information with

a communication port address for a pinhole created in the firewall (Trossen, Paragraph

0008, IP-Level Handoff), and forwarding the information packet to a destination address

across the firewall using the communication port address for the pinhole communication

port (Trossen, Paragraph 0024) but fails to teach a trusted entity. However, in an

analogous art O'keefe teaches a trusted entity (O'Keefe Col. 1 Lines 47 – 55, trusted

server).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to person of

ordinary skill in the art to use O'Keefe's trusted content server with Trossen's relocation

of content sources during IP-level handoffs because it offers the advantage of seeing if

content received can be trusted based on its origins (O'Keefe Col. 2 Lines 30 – 40).

15.   As per claim 9, Trossen teaches creating a communication port address routing

table association on the trusted entity for designated pinhole ports in the firewall using

address data from the create pinhole request (Trossen, Paragraph 0008, IP-Level

Handoff).

16.   As per claims 10 and 11, Trossen teaches transmitting said create pinhole

request from the end-terminal to the trusted entity (Trossen, Paragraph 0024, RSVP

protocol), and receiving a create media pinhole acknowledgement at the end-terminal

containing the communication port address (Trossen, Paragraph 0024, Confirmation

message).

17.   As per claim 12, Trossen teaches the application server is a session initiation

protocol proxy server (Trossen, Paragraph 0017, SIP protocol usage).

18.   As per claim 13, Trossen teaches the application server is an integrated access

device (Trossen, Paragraph 0007, Content sources are integrated access devices along

with mobile terminals).

19.   As per claim 15, Trossen teaches providing an entity having an input and an

output outside the communication network, linking said trusted entity to the pinhole

communication port (Trossen, Paragraph 0024), transmitting a first signal from the

communication network to the input of the entity, wherein said signal has an address

designation for said pinhole communication port (Trossen, Paragraph 0008, IP-Level

Handoff) providing a routing table on the entity with the address designations for the

pinhole communication port (Trossen, Paragraph 0008, IP-Level Handoff), receiving a

packet transmission at the input of the entity to be sent to a communication device

inside the communication network; placing the address designation for the pinhole

communication port as the address header of the packet transmission and transmitting

the packet transmission from the output of the entity to the pinhole communication port

for transmission onto the communication device (Trossen, Paragraph 0024, pinhole is

created in the firewall with use of IP-Level Handoff) but fails to teach a trusted entity.

However, in an analogous art O'keefe teaches a trusted entity (O'Keefe Col. 1 Lines 47 – 55, trusted server).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to person of ordinary skill in the art to use O'Keefe's trusted content server with Trossen's relocation of content sources during IP-level handoffs because it offers the advantage of seeing if content received can be trusted based on its origins (O'Keefe Col. 2 Lines 30 – 40).

20.   As per claim 16, Trossen teaches transmitting a second signal from the output of the trusted entity containing the address designation of the communication port, wherein said second signal acknowledges receipt of the first signal (Trossen, Paragraph 0024, Signaling protocols).

21.   As per claim 17, Trossen teaches receiving the second signal at the communication device (Trossen, Paragraph 0024, Signaling protocols).

22.   As per claim 18, Trossen teaches receiving the second signal at a server on the communication network (Trossen, Paragraph 0025, message to content source).

23.   Claims 14, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trossen et al. U.S. PG-Publication No. (2003/0212764) and O'keefe U.S. Patent No. (6,941,477) and in further view of Wu et al. U.S. PG-Publication No. (2003/0212809).

24.   As per claim 14, Trossen fails to teach the application server is an application

proxy server. However, in an analogous art Wu teaches the application server is an

application proxy server (Wu, Paragraph 0038).

At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to use Wu's real

time streaming media communication system with Trossen's relocation of content

sources during IP-level handoffs because it offers the advantage of allowing clients to

make indirect network connections to other network services.

25.   As per claim 19, Trossen fails to teach the transmission packet contains voice

data. However, in an analogous art Wu teaches the transmission packet contains voice

data (Wu, Paragraph 0036, audio).

At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to use Wu's real

time streaming media communication system with Trossen's relocation of content

sources during IP-level handoffs because it offers the advantage of streaming data to

remote end points (Wu, Paragraph 0031).

26.   As per claim 20, Trossen fails to teach the transmission packet is a real time

transport protocol information packet. However, in an analogous art Wu teaches the

transmission packet is a real time transport protocol information packet (Wu, Paragraph

0036, real-time stream).

At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to use Wu's real

time streaming media communication system with Trossen's relocation of content

sources during IP-level handoffs because it offers the advantage of streaming data to

remote end points (Wu, Paragraph 0031).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Roderick Tolentino whose telephone number is (571)

272-2661. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kambiz Zand can be reached on (571) 272-3811. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Roderick Tolentino
Examiner
Art Unit 2134

Roderick Tolentino

KAMBIZ ZAND
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER